

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: **W. David Conley**)
)
Serial No.: **09/475,531**) Art Unit: 2743
)
Filed: **December 30, 1999**) Examiner: Duc Nguyen
)
For: **METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR**)
CHARGING A SET ACTIVATION)
FEE FOR PAY TELEPHONE USAGE)

Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

18/D
10-15-03
K

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 10 2003

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION
MAILED APRIL 9TH, 2003

OFFICIAL

Dear Sir:

The undersigned thanks the Patent Examiner for his review of the Amendment and Response filed regarding the Office Action mailed November 6, 2002.

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I certify this correspondence, along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed, is being transmitted via facsimile transmission to the United States Postal Service on this 9th day of October, 2003.

Nora M. Tocups
Nora M. Tocups

PATENTS
U.S.S.N. 09/475,531
Filed: December 30, 1999
Response to Office Action Mailed April 9th, 2003

The subsequent Office Action mailed April 9, 2003 erroneously rejects all of the claims. Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by *Nolting et al.*, United States Patent No. 6,351,453. Claims 1-11 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C Section 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Nolting et al.* in view of *Lesley*, United States Patent No. 6,88,752. Claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C Section 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Nolting et al.* in view of *Lesley* and *Casner*, United States Patent No. 4,517,411. Claims 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C Section 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Golden*, United States Patent No. 4,897,870 in view of *Nolting et al.*

The rejections of the claims are respectfully traversed. The claims have been amended, as indicated, but only to more specifically point out the respective inventions.